

REMARKS

In section 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 31-47 under 35 U.S.C. §112, paragraph one as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner invites applicant to point out portions of the application that disclose the claim limitations relating to televisions which modify their operations in response to command signals from a host device. Accordingly, the Examiner's attention is directed to the following seven passages from the application.

The second paragraph of the Summary section of the present application discloses the following: "In accordance with another aspect of the invention, a method of controlling the television is provided which comprises receiving a command signal from a host device, modifying television operation based on the command signal, and transmitting a confirmation signal from the television to the host device confirming the modification of the television operation."

Also, page 5, lines 2-4 of the application disclose the following: "The teachings of the invention provide a mechanism and process by which the host device 24 is ensured that the individual televisions 22 have

successfully completed a function after it has been commanded to do so."

Moreover, page 6, lines 12-17 of the application discloses the following: "Furthermore, after the command signals 68 are successfully received by each of the televisions 22 and the television functions dictated by the command signal 68 are successfully accomplished, each of the televisions 22 is able to generate a confirmation signal 70. The host device 24 is therefore insured that a prior function has been successfully accomplished before it proceeds to command further functions to be performed."

Further, page 7, lines 9-13 of the application disclose the following: "If the confirmation signals 70 have been received, the host device processor 64 generates and transmits the command signal or signals 68 to each of the televisions 22 as indicated by a step 77. Each of the televisions 22 then attempts to perform the commanded television function, as illustrated, for example, in FIG. 4."

In addition, page 7, lines 14-20 of the application disclose the following: "each television 22 may begin by receiving the command signal 68 as indicated by a step 78. The television 22 then attempts to perform

the commanded function as indicated by a step 80. If the television 22 did not perform the commanded function as determined at a step 81, no confirmation signal is generated as indicated by a step 82. In this case, for example, the host 24 may resend the command or take other appropriate action as indicated at step 76 of FIG. 4."

Also, page 7, lines 21-23 of the application disclose the following: "If the television 22 is able to successfully perform the television function commanded, the processor 46 of each of the televisions 22 generates the confirmation signals 70 as indicated by a step 86."

Finally, page 8, lines 14-22 of the application disclose the following: "From the foregoing, one of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate that the system afforded by the teachings of the invention can be used to create a television or television control system or method of controlling a television which not only transmits signals from a host device to one or more televisions, but also provides a closed loop control system wherein each of the controlled televisions generates a confirmation signal once the demanded television function is successfully performed. In so doing, the host device is provided with confirmation that

the requested and commanded function has been performed prior to subsequent requests being commanded."

As can be seen, these portions of the written description fully support the amendments made in applicant's previous response so that the claims contain no new matter.

In section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 31-47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies in view of Ben-Ze'ev and further in view of Shintani.

(In the first full paragraph of page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner cites only Davies and Ben-Ze'ev in the rejection of claims 31-47, 49, and 51. However, in the first two full paragraphs of page 4 of the Office Action spanning lines 3-18, the Examiner also relies on Shintani for this rejection.)

Davies and Ben-Ze'ev fail to disclose or suggest the invention of independent claims 31 and 42 for at least two reasons.

First, Davies and Ben-Ze'ev fail to disclose or suggest plural televisions that transmit confirmation signals indicating that the televisions have modified their operation.

Second, Davies and Ben-Ze'ev fail to disclose or suggest a host processor that determines which televisions do not transmit confirmation signals indicating that they have modified their operation.

The Examiner recognizes that Davies fails to disclose or suggest either (i) plural televisions that transmit confirmation signals indicating that the televisions have modified their operation or (ii) a host processor that determines which televisions do not transmit confirmation signals indicating that they have modified their operation.

Therefore, the Examiner relies on Ben-Ze'ev. However, the Examiner's reliance on Ben-Ze'ev is misplaced.

First, the Examiner characterizes column 10, lines 49-65 of Ben-Ze'ev as a disclosure of a remote controller that periodically interrogates the status of remote devices. This characterization is inaccurate.

Column 10, lines 49-65 of Ben-Ze'ev merely state that the remote controller periodically interrogates the existence of appliances within its vicinity. Thus, there is no disclosure or suggestion in this portion of Ben-Ze'ev that the appliances supply their statuses to the remote controller.

Second, the Examiner characterizes column 13, lines 44-50 of Ben-Ze'ev as a disclosure that the remote controller receives confirmation that the appliances has executed a commanded function. This characterization is inaccurate.

Column 13, lines 44-50 of Ben-Ze'ev merely state that the remote controller receives alert signals from the appliances. These alerts indicate, for example, that a kettle has finished boiling water. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Ben-Ze'ev that the alerts are in response to a commanded function or an interrogation.

Accordingly, as in the case of Davies, Ben-Ze'ev fails to disclose or suggest either (i) plural televisions (or any appliances) that transmit confirmation signals indicating that they have modified their operation or (ii) a host processor that determines which televisions (or appliances) do not transmit confirmation signals indicating that they have modified their operation.

The Examiner does not cite any specific portion of Shintani as particularly pertinent in overcoming the deficiencies of Davies and Ben-Ze'ev.

Shintani discloses a remote control 100 and a television set 101 each having a transmitter and a receiver such that signals can be communicated between the remote control 100 and the television set 101 by way of a communications link 102. The television set 101 can send a confirmation signal to the remote control 100 when a valid instruction is received by the television set 101 from the remote control 100. Alternatively, the television set 101 can send an error signal to the remote control 100 when an invalid instruction is received by the television set 101 from the remote control 100. The television set 101 can send a prompt signal to the remote control 100 when an instruction received by the television set 101 from the remote control 100 requires additional input in order to execute the instruction.

Accordingly, as in the case of Davies and Ben-Ze'ev, Shintani fails to disclose or suggest either (i) plural televisions that transmit confirmation signals indicating that they have modified their operation or (ii) a host processor that determines which televisions do not transmit confirmation signals indicating that they have modified their operation.

Therefore, because Davies, Ben-Ze'ev, and Shintani taken alone or in combination do not disclose or

suggest plural televisions that return confirmation signals indicating that they have modified their operation as commanded by a host device, and because Davies, Ben-Ze'ev, and Shintani taken together do not disclose or suggest determining which of the televisions fail to send such a confirmation signal, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Davies, Ben-Ze'ev, and Shintani so as to produce the inventions of claims 31-47.

Accordingly, claims 31-47 are not unpatentable over Davies in view of Ben-Ze'ev and further in view of Shintani.

Moreover, Shintani does not even disclose that its confirmation signal confirms that the television has modified its operation as commanded. The confirmation signal merely confirms that a valid instruction has been received by the television, not that the television actually modified its operation in response to the valid instruction.

Accordingly, Shintani cannot be used in the manner that the Examiner has used Shintani to reject claims 31-47. For this reason also, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

combine Davies, Ben-Ze'ev, and Shintani so as to produce the inventions of claims 31-47.

For all of the reasons give above, claims 31-47 are patentable over Davies in view of Ben-Ze'ev (and further in view of Shintani).

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is clear that the claims of the present application patentably distinguish over the art applied by the Examiner. Accordingly, allowance of these claims and issuance of the above captioned patent application are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required, or to credit any overpayment, to account No. 26 0175.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHIFF HARDIN LLP
6600 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6402
(312) 258-5774
CUSTOMER NO. 28574

By: Mark Bergner
Mark Bergner
Reg. No: 45,877

April 19, 2007